REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-9, 11-12 and 14-19 are as previously presented. Claims 2 and 13 have been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 10 and 20 are presently amended. No admission or representation is made by the present argument other than that explicitly provided herein.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 20 have been amended to clarify that the notification profiles define notification control options that apply to events that are each "generated by a respective event generating and handling component, the first and second notification profiles each defining notification control options for at least two different event generating and handling components". This amendment clarifies that different events are generated by different event generating and handling components.

Claim 10 has been further amended for clarification of the claimed subject matter. Specifically, claim 10 has been amended to recite a device for "controlling notifications for events", each notification profile "defining notification options", and logic to compare the switch condition with "at least one of a current time and a current location". These amendments merely bring the language of claim 10 into conformance with that of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Martinez (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0142792) in view of Moton (U.S. Patent No. 7,116,977). The Applicant submits that the independent claims are both novel and unobvious in view of Martinez and Moton alone or in combination for the reasons set forth below.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 20 are directed to a method, device and computer program product, respectively, for controlling notification of events in a mobile device. The mobile device has at least first and second notification profiles comprising respective sets of notification control options. The mobile device switches from a first to a second notification profile based on a comparison of one or both of a time parameter and a

location parameter to the current time and current location. Each notification profile defines notification control options that apply to the notification of events generated by a respective event generating and handling component. Each notification profile applies to at least two different event generating and handling components, including at least two of an alarm, a calendar, email, phone and SMS (short message service).

In a mobile device having many functions, event notifications may each separately arise from a number of individual different event generating and handling components. It is a hassle for the user to change the event notification control option for each component separately. For example, a user wanting quiet notifications would have to separately set the notification to vibrate for the alarm, then the calendar, then the email, and so forth. The claimed subject matter provides a simpler way of setting notification control options based on the time and/or location of the mobile device. The present claims describe the use of notification profiles that provide a single definition governing the notification control options for <u>at least two different event generating and handling components</u>. Thus, when a notification profile is switched due to a change in time and/or location, the notification control options for different event generating and handling components can all be switched at once. The user only has to define a switch condition for the single notification profile, rather than having to define a switch condition for each event generating and handling component separately.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has interpreted the claims to mean "the usage of plurality of notification options for various events," based on a reading of paragraphs [0041]-[0043] of the description. The Examiner has emphasized passages stating that an application may have a plurality of event generating and handling components, that each event generating and handling component may have different options for notifying an event, and that these notification options may be different for different profiles. It is submitted that this is irrelevant to the present claims.

While it may be that each event may have a plurality of notification options (e.g., vibration or ring tone), this does not change the fact that different events are generated by different event generating and handling components, and that the claims recite a plurality

of event generating and handling components. Notification for an event may be by way of vibrations or a ring tone, but that event is still associated with a respective event generating and handling component. For example, notification for a calendar event is handled by a calendar component while notification for an alarm event is handled by an alarm component, regardless of what form that notification takes. The claims clearly require more than one event generating and handling component, each having respective notification control options for controlling notification of respective events, regardless of the fact that each event may have a plurality of notification options.

As explained in the previous response filed on February 26, 2008, Martinez fails to teach or suggest the feature of a notification profile defining notification control options for at least two different event generating and handling components. Martinez is concerned with only a cell phone, which is only one event generating and handling component. Although Martinez describes a calendar component, there is no mention of this calendar component being used to generate or handle notifications, but only as a trigger for changing the notification control option for the cell phone. Indeed, in the long list of settings provided in paragraph [0021], Martinez fail to list any event notifications that might be associated with an event generating and handling component other than a cell phone component.

Martinez is only concerned with event notifications arising from a single component, namely the cell phone. However, as clearly stated in the present claims, each event is generated by a respective event generating and handling component. Thus, a notification profile applying to only one component, as taught by Martinez, cannot successfully handle notification options for a variety of different events generated by different event generating and handling components, as in the present claims.

The failings of Martinez are not remedied by a combination with Moton. Moton discloses a system and method for using location information to execute an action, such as routing telephone calls, based on the location of a wireless device. The Examiner relies

on Moton to teach the use of location information to trigger a switch between notification profiles. However, similar to Martinez, Moton is concerned only with cell phone services, which is only one component. Moton does not teach or suggest the use of a single profile governing notification options for different events each generated by different event generating and handling components, the profile being applied to at least two such components, as presently claimed. A person skilled in the art combining Martinez with Moton would arrive at a system that still fails to provide a notification profile defining notification options for <u>at least two</u> event generating and handling components.

Thus, Moton also fails to disclose all the features of the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 10 and 20 are novel and inventive over a combination of Martinez with Moton. The remaining claims are dependent on claims 1, 10 and 20, and so are also novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing arguments, it is submitted that the pending claims are patentable over Martinez and/or Moton because neither Martinez nor Moton, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claims.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions in connection with the Applicant's submissions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

Date: June 24, 2008

BY:_____/mve/_____
   Michael Van Eesbeek
   Registration No. 61,951
   Tel: (416) 216-4020
   Fax: (416)216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2Z4
Canada